

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DON HAERLING,

Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-02-0010

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair; on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated April 22, 2002. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on November 5, 2002. René Ewing, Member, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Don Haerling appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Fish and Wildlife was represented by Karol Rodgers, Human Resources Consultant.

Background. On November 8, 2001, the Personnel Resources Board approved combining several general accounting classifications and creating a new class series, Financial Analyst 1-5, which became effective January 2, 2002. As a result of this action, Human Resource Consultant Sue Vance reviewed Appellant's classification questionnaire (CQ), dated January 9, 2002, and reallocated his position as an Accountant 2 to a Financial Analyst 2 position, effective January 2, 2002. Appellant believed that his position should have been allocated to the Financial Analyst 3 class, and on March 11, 2002, he filed an appeal to Ms. Vance's January 10, 2002, allocation

1 determination with the Department of Personnel. Appellant also submitted an addendum to his CQ
2 describing additional duties he felt were not reviewed by Ms Vance. Ms. Vance considered this
3 addendum but still concluded that Appellant was properly allocated to the Financial Analyst 2
4 classification.

5
6 On April 10, 2002, Paul Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, conducted a review concerning the
7 allocation of Appellant's position. By letter dated April 22, 2002, Mr. Peterson notified Appellant
8 that his position was properly allocated as a Financial Analyst 2. On May 20, 2002, Appellant filed
9 exceptions to the Department of Personnel's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board.

10
11 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant alleges that the January 9, 2002 CQ did not
12 contain all his current duties and is not representative of the work he performs. Appellant asserts
13 that he would not have signed the CQ dated January 9, if he had known that it was part of a class
14 study. Appellant argues that his duties have changed since May 2001 when his supervisor assigned
15 him to perform lead work duties such as auditing the daily transaction log. Appellant acknowledges
16 that he does not meet the definition of a lead worker, but asserts that nonetheless he functions as a
17 lead.

18 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's placement to the
19 Financial Analyst 2 classification was based on the CQ in his personnel file, which was dated
20 January 9, 2002. Respondent argues that the CQ was current and accurately reflected the duties
21 performed by Appellant. Respondent argues that Appellant's position does not meet the definition
22 of the Financial Analyst 3 specification because 1) he does not function as a financial lead worker,
23 and 2) he is not designated by management to perform as a lead worker, as required by the
24 Financial Analyst 3 specification. Respondent further argues that Appellant's position does not
25 perform professional senior level financial review or analysis of data, which is also required by the
26

1 definition of the Financial Analyst 3 job specification. Respondent argues that Appellant's position
2 is best described by the Financial Analyst 2 classification.

3 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
4 to the Financial Analyst 2 classification should be affirmed.

5
6 **Relevant Classifications.** Financial Analyst 2, class code 12106; and Financial Analyst 3, class
7 code 12107.

8
9 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
10 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
11 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
12 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
13 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
14 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
15 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
16 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

17
18 The definition of a Financial Analyst 3 states that the incumbent, "Functions as a financial lead
19 worker or performs professional senior-level financial review and analysis of accounting,
20 budgeting, auditing or fiscal data ..." The first option under the distinguishing characteristics for
21 allocation to the FA 3 class requires the incumbent to be designated by management to lead one or
22 more professional staff. Appellant is not designated by management to lead professional staff.
23 However, to support his contention that he performs lead work, Appellant submitted an addendum
24 to his CQ that describes his lead work over four Account Auditors 2. The addendum states that
25 Appellant verifies entries made by the auditors into the Department of Personnel's Human Resource
26 Information System Division (HRISD) payroll system using the agency daily transaction log; he

1 notifies the auditors of any errors and he explains how to correct the errors. Appellant also answers
2 questions from auditors concerning Merit System rules, FLSA (Federal Labor Standards Act) and
3 agency policies.

4
5 The agency did not dispute the tasks outlined in the addendum. Moreover, the addendum was
6 reviewed by human resource staff, who still determined that Appellant was appropriately classified
7 in the Financial Analyst 2 class. After our review, we cannot conclude that the duties described
8 support that Appellant performs lead work. The duties, however, are in accordance with his
9 responsibility to verify and reconcile employee time sheets. Furthermore, Appellant does not
10 design, develop, install, coordinate or maintain one or more financial systems nor does he analyze
11 review projections, budget or expenditure forecasts as required by the second and third options of
12 distinguishing characteristics for the allocation to the Financial Analyst 3 classification.

13
14 The definition and distinguishing characteristics of the Financial Analyst 2 classification are as
15 follows:

16
17 **Definition:** Performs professional journey level financial review and analysis of
account, budgeting, auditing or fiscal data

18
19 **Distinguishing Characteristics:** This is a journey level of the Financial Analyst
series. This level is experienced and makes decisions independently under
20 general supervision within their area of responsibility. Positions can perform
general or specialized fiscal duties in a variety of financial areas including
21 accounting, budgeting, auditing, or other financial review work for a state agency.

22

23
24 Appellant's approved CQ, which he signed on January 9, 2002, reflects that he performs the
25 following duties 75 percent of his time:

1 Perform high level, specialized accounting with varied accounting records.
2 Responsible for development, implementing and maintaining new accounting
3 system to reconcile AFRS with agency original entry. Audit procedures and
4 record any errors between time sheets and payments.

5 Appellant's primary duty is to verify and reconcile agency employee times sheets against automated
6 reports from the DOP HRISD, a function which involves interpretation of complex statistical data.
7 Appellant also prepares journal vouchers, and he reconciles time accounting, and distributes,
8 interprets and corrects time accounting reports for management and budget staff. Appellant's duties
9 are clearly encompassed by the definition, distinguishing characteristics and typical work of the
10 Financial Analyst 2 classification, therefore, his appeal should be denied.

11 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
12 determination dated April 22, 2002, should be affirmed and adopted.

13
14 **ORDER**

15 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
16 denied and the Director's determination dated April 22, 2002, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
17 attached.

18 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

19
20 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

21
22 _____
23 Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

24
25 _____
26 René Ewing, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504